DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 320 131 CS 010 128

AUTHOR Zajano, Nancy C.
TITLE Reading Recovery and ESEA Chapter 1: Issues and Possibilities.
INSTITUTION Ohio State Univ., Columbus. Coll. of Education.
PUB DATE Jul 89
NOTE 29p.
PUB TYPE Reports - Evaluative/Feasibility (142)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Beginning Reading; Comparative Analysis; Educational Planning; *High Risk Students; *Instructional Effectiveness; Primary Education; *Reading Instruction
IDENTIFIERS Educational Issues; *Education Consolidation Improvement Act Chapter 1; *Reading Recovery Projects

ABSTRACT

The simultaneous implementation of Reading Recovery (an early intervention program designed to help children "at risk" of failure in their first year of reading instruction) and Chapter 1 programs in schools raises a number of issues as educators attempt to provide effective reading instruction within the policies and guidelines of both programs. This paper discusses five implemention issues and possible ways of addressing them. The issues are: (1) selection of students; (2) evaluation of effectiveness of Chapter 1 and Reading Recovery Programs; (3) number of students served; (4) coordination of reading instruction; and (5) accounting for Chapter 1 funds used in support of Reading Recovery Services. Each issue is examined in turn and possibilities and/or suggestions for the resolution of each are discussed. The implication of this analysis is that both Chapter 1 and Reading Recovery policies and practices may need to be adjusted so that each may accommodate the instructional and accountability needs of the other. To accommodate both approaches, educators need to address the dilemmas surrounding these issues. (Twenty-seven references are attached.) (RS)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED320131

READING RECOVERY AND ESEA CHAPTER 1:

ISSUES AND POSSIBILITIES

Nancy C. Zajano

July, 1989

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

NANCY C. ZAJANO

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

This paper was sponsored and published by PROBE (Policy Research for Ohio Based Education). PROBE provides research and analysis on statewide educational and social policy concerns and is directed jointly by Dr. Robert Donmoyer and Dr. Brad Mitchell. For further information, please contact:

PROBE
The Ohio State University
College of Education
301 Ramseyer Hall
29 West Woodruff Avenue
Columbus, Ohio 43210

(614) 292-7909

CS010128

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Table of Contents

Page

Introduction.....1

Program Purposes.....2

Issue 1: Selection of Students.....4
Possibilities.....6

Issue 2: Evaluation of Effectiveness.....10
Possibilities.....13

Issue 3: Number of Students Served.....14
Possibilities.....16

Issue 4: Coordination of Reading Instruction.....19
Possibilities.....20

Issue 5: Accounting for Chapter 1 Funds.....22
Possibilities.....23

Conclusion.....24

References.....25

Introduction

Reading Recovery is an early intervention program designed to help children "at-risk" of failure in their first year of reading instruction (Pinnell, 1987a). It is now being used in over 200 school districts in Ohio and is beginning to appear in other states and Canada. As of the 1988-89 school year, Arizona, Illinois, South Carolina, and Texas have programs in operation and another eight states have teacher leaders being prepared to bring the program to their schools.

School districts in some of these states are considering implementing Reading Recovery with the assistance of federal compensatory education "Chapter 1" funds. The simultaneous implementation of Reading Recovery and Chapter 1 programs in schools raises a number of issues as educators attempt to provide effective reading instruction within the policies and guidelines of both programs. Given that both programs have the similar purpose of assisting young students who are having academic difficulty, the resolution of these issues is important to children and educators alike. This document describes five such issues and offers some possible ways of addressing them. The purpose of this document is not to analyze the effectiveness of either Reading Recovery or other forms of Chapter 1 programming, but rather to discuss their simultaneous implementation within the same schools. The five implementation issues include:

1. Selection of students
2. Evaluation of effectiveness of Chapter 1 and Reading Recovery programs
3. Number of students served
4. Coordination of reading instruction
5. Accounting for Chapter 1 funds used in support of Reading Recovery services

As with most complex human endeavors, each of these issues is intertwined in practice with each of the others. For discussion purposes, however, each issue is presented in isolation. To set the context for the discussion of the issues and possibilities regarding the simultaneous implementation of Chapter 1 and Reading Recovery, a brief description of the purpose of each program is offered first.

Program Purposes

Federal compensatory education programs were initiated under Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA) of 1965. This legislation was reorganized under Chapter 1 of the Education Consolidation and Improvement Act (ECIA) of 1981. Over the years these programs have been referred to variously as "Title I" and "Chapter 1" programs. In 1988, the original Elementary and Secondary Education Act was amended to further revise compensatory education programs. The latest revisions are included in Chapter 1 of Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act as amended. References in this document to "Chapter 1" pertain to these 1988 amendments (Augustus F. Hawkins-Robert T. Stafford Elementary and Secondary School Improvement Amendments of 1988).

Chapter 1 policy, as stated in this legislation, is intended to "provide financial assistance to state and local educational agencies to meet the special needs of educational deprived children at the preschool, elementary and secondary level" (p. 12). The purpose of this assistance is to improve the educational opportunities of these children by helping them succeed in the regular school program, attain grade-level proficiency, and improve their achievement in basic and more advanced skills (p. 12). The law goes on to note that the programs and projects funded by Chapter 1 dollars are to be of "of sufficient size, scope, and quality to give reasonable promise of substantial progress toward meeting the special educational needs of the children being served" (p. 23).

The Reading Recovery program, developed by New Zealand educator and psychologist Marie M. Clay (1985), is designed to teach strategies used by successful readers to those children who are at risk of failure in their first year of formal reading instruction. Providing intensive help on a one-to-one basis for approximately 60 lessons, the intent is to "recover" first grade children who are considered the poorest readers in their classrooms (the lowest 20%) and who would ordinarily fall further behind their peers in reading achievement. The goal is for the "recovered" children to reach average reading levels for their group and maintain their gains, requiring no further special reading assistance during their school years (Boehlein, 1987; Pinnell, 1987a; Pinnell, 1987b; Pinnell, 1985; Young & Pinnell, 1987).

Nationally, about 75% of children receiving Chapter 1 services are participating in a reading program (Birman et al., 1987; Gutmann & Henderson, 1988). Since the intent of both Reading Recovery and Chapter 1

programs is to serve the special needs of students who are having difficulty learning to read, the two programs are often targeted to the same children in the school. The question of how best to coordinate the implementation of these programs for the benefit of all eligible students partially depends upon the successful resolution of the issues addressed below.

Issue 1: Selection of Students

Reading Recovery selection guidelines specify serving the lowest 20% reading achievers in first grade classrooms. Identification of these children takes place through a combination of teacher judgement and a battery of six individually-administered diagnostic instruments (letter identification, basal word test, concepts about print, writing vocabulary, dictation, and text reading level). Selection guidelines from federal ECIA Chapter 1 policy specify identifying and serving those students "who have the greatest need for special assistance" (Augustus F. Hawkins-Robert T. Stafford Elementary and Secondary School Improvement Amendments of 1988, p. 25). The customary procedure for identifying Chapter 1 students is the administration of a norm-referenced test of reading achievement. Those children who score below a designated percentile on such a test are considered eligible for services; those scoring at the lowest percentile on the test usually are considered those most needing the program services and are to be selected first. Furthermore, the selection of Chapter 1 children must be based on instruments "uniformly applied to particular grade levels"; that is, the same instruments must be given to all children within a grade level who are being considered for Chapter 1 services (p. 25).

At first glance, these two selection approaches appear compatible. Several dilemmas occur, however, as these two practices are implemented simultaneously. What if the child scoring lowest on the norm-referenced test is not the one scoring lowest on the diagnostic tests? What about the child who reads fluently but performs poorly on any test? The question becomes what evidence should be trusted as the most valid and reliable for identifying the child who is most at-risk of reading failure and hence most in need of services, while also meeting the legal requirements of Chapter 1?

On the one hand, the educator doing the selection is faced with the requirement to use a given test score. To assure consistency and fairness in the selection process, the score is typically based on a group administered multiple-choice test which has been normed on a national sample. Because of the nature of the test and the testing situation, however, the child could answer items by randomly choosing one of the given options. On the other hand, the educator has information from the judgement of the teacher who has observed the child's daily classroom performance and information from the collective results of six different, individually-administered diagnostic instruments in which the child is required to produce a response rather than choose from given options. The issue for selecting first graders in Reading Recovery becomes what criteria to use in the face of contradictory evidence about the student's reading performance.

Another selection issue pertains to second graders who had succeeded in Reading Recovery to the point of being "discontinued" (and thereby designated as no longer in need of services) during their first grade

year, yet score at or below the cutoff percentile on the Chapter 1 selection test for second grade. Should these students receive Chapter 1 reading services as second graders? Once again, the question rests on what evidence should be used as the criteria for selecting students for services.

An important feature of the Chapter 1 law and accompanying regulations is the assurance that federal dollars are used for targeted students and are not dissipated into the general funds of the school district. Hence having a valid procedure for selecting targeted students is crucial for a school district to be in compliance with the federal law. Developing a selection procedure which complies with the law and accurately identifies the students most in need of services is the challenge for teachers and administrators using Chapter 1 funds to help implement the Reading Recovery program in their schools.

Possibilities

Given that the Chapter 1 and Reading Recovery programs have the identical purpose of identifying and serving children most in need of assistance in reading, one way to satisfy the policy guidelines of both programs is to use a percentile criterion (e.g., the 30th) as an initial screening device for identifying a pool of eligible first graders. Within this pool, the precise selection of the children who need the most assistance could be based on all the available evidence regarding their reading performance: their daily classroom work; diagnostic test scores; and judgements of teachers who know them well and have listened to them read.

A critical concern regarding any selection procedure, especially for programs using federal funds, is that it be systematic and non-arbitrary in its identification of students. The process suggested above provides for the systematic screening of students using a percentile cutoff score on a norm-referenced standardized test as the standard criterion for eligibility. The actual selection of particular students from within the eligible pool can include the systematic use of the Reading Recovery diagnostic tests for all eligible students, coupled with the professional judgment of teachers in a position to closely observe the child's reading performance over time and in a variety of classroom situations. In this way, a systematic and non-arbitrary selection process incorporates professional judgments from those who know the students best.

This approach has the advantage of overcoming some of the questions which have traditionally been raised about the reliability of norm-referenced tests for low-scoring and very young children. Since norm-referenced tests are designed to distinguish among students (Henryssen, 1971) and the highest reliability is obtained when students, on the average, get slightly more than half the items correct (Roberts, 1976), the tests are not as reliable for those students scoring at the extreme upper and lower ends of the distribution (that is, those obtaining either very high or very low scores). For students who answer very few questions correctly, the test scores can manifest what is known as a "floor effect", that is, the test is so difficult for them it does not accurately measure the reading achievement they do have. In essence, they may be getting the answers correct or incorrect simply by guessing alone; a factor which severely reduces the reliability of the test (Roberts, A.

H., 1976; Roberts, S. J., 1978). (For those scoring at the high end of the distribution, the test is so easy that it may not accurately measure additional knowledge and skill the students may possess; in essence, they have encountered a "ceiling effect".) The Chapter 1 recommendation for avoiding floor and ceiling effects is to give the student a test level lower or higher than the ones ordinarily designated for their grades (Roberts, 1976). This strategy is not possible, however, for low-scoring first graders who are already taking the lowest available level of the achievement test. (One possibility would be to use preschool or readiness tests for selection of Chapter 1 first graders.)

Another age-related concern is the difficulty of obtaining an accurate assessment of very young students. Oftentimes, young children early in their first grade year are unfamiliar with the format of the written test and the formalized procedures used to administer the instrument. In response to this strange material and this strange situation, their testing behavior may be erratic and unpredictable. The resulting test scores may not accurately represent their reading ability.

In the approach suggested above, the norm-referenced test scores would be used only as an overall screening device and not as a pinpoint measure of the student's actual reading ability. As a result, the shortcomings associated with floor effects and the testing of young children in unfamiliar situations may not interfere with the likelihood of selecting the lowest achieving first grade students. Consequently, the mutual goal of Chapter 1 and Reading Recovery of serving the first graders most in need can be accomplished while complying with the policy guidelines of both programs.

To address the issue of whether second graders who have been discontinued in Reading Recovery yet scored at or below the designated percentile on the Chapter 1 selection test should receive Chapter 1 services, the possibilities again include using all of the evidence available from the classroom to make the determination. The task is to check whether or not the assumption that a child who has been discontinued from Reading Recovery is able to perform at the average level in his/her classroom is correct in this case. To do so, teachers could ask specific questions about the child's classroom performance: Does he or she read at or above what is considered average for the class? Is he or she able to read grade-level passages of text with understanding? How did he or she perform on the diagnostic tests completed at the point of discontinuing with Reading Recovery?

A part of the professional judgment to be made is how will the child perform in the second-grade classroom without additional services. Could he or she respond to the challenge of higher expectations? Will the child see the provision of Chapter 1 services after being discontinued from Reading Recovery as a signal that he or she is not performing as well as in the past? These questions can only be answered by those closest to the child; by those who are familiar not only with the student's reading performance but also with his/her self-concept and dispositions.

An additional decision to be made by the educators close to the situation is whether there are other children who need the Chapter 1 services more than this child. The process of selecting those most in need of services includes not using a scarce resource for a child for whom there is contradictory evidence of need if there are others who are more clearly in need of Chapter 1 assistance.

Issue 2: Evaluation of Effectiveness

The different ways in which the Chapter 1 and Reading Recovery programs measure their effectiveness can raise troublesome issues as the programs are implemented simultaneously in the same schools. Underlying the issue of the evaluation of program effectiveness is the fundamental question: What "counts" as reading achievement?

Currently the effectiveness of Chapter 1 programs are evaluated through a comparison of the average pre- and post-scores on norm-referenced achievement tests. If the students average a Normal Curve Equivalent (NCE) score (comparable to the percentile) which is at least seven points higher after Chapter 1 instruction than it was before, the difference is attributed to the success of the Chapter 1 intervention (Chapter One in Ohio, 1987; Kennedy, 1987; National Institute of Education, 1978). Many of the children served will return for continued support services during the following school year, however (Kenoyer, Cooper, Saxton, Hoepfner, 1981; Pinnell, DeFord, Lyons, 1988).

For Reading Recovery, effectiveness is measured by the child being "discontinued" from the program. Discontinued students are expected to be able to continue to derive meaning from the increasingly difficult selections of text presented in regular classroom materials. The number and percentage of children so recovered and needing no further special assistance during subsequent years of schooling is one of the measures of program effectiveness.

The fundamental issue of what "counts" as reading achievement is reflected in these two approaches to program evaluation. For Chapter 1, the average NCE gain score is a shorthand way of aggregating and reporting

the changes in test scores across the many students served by the program throughout the country. The critical task for each student, therefore, is answering relatively more items correctly on the post-test than on the pretest. The test becomes the vehicle for demonstrating improved reading achievement. Whether or not the test always provides an accurate portrayal of the reading task is one of the controversial aspects of the program effectiveness issue.

If a child is able to randomly select correct answers without comprehending the meaning of the text, his test score can be falsely inflated. If he is able to understand long, elaborated passages of text, but is not able to make sense out of short, cryptic sentences, his score will be falsely deflated. If a significant number of test items focus on word attack and phonetic skills in isolation from meaningful passages, the Reading Recovery student whose instruction has emphasized deriving meaning from the the full context will be at a disadvantage. If the child has been taught to use context clues to figure out the meaning of an unknown word, the child may have trouble when faced with a list of words without a context. Not being able to select the correct answer does not necessarily mean that the child does not know how to "read." The question of what "counts" as reading takes center stage here. Is it comprehending the meaning of the elaborated text or is it getting a specific number of items correct on a test?

As an example of this issue, the primer level of the 1985 Metropolitan Achievement Tests series, Form L, includes 89 multiple choice items in its reading survey test (Prescott, Balow, Hogan, Farr, 1985). Of these 89 items, 51 are devoted to vocabulary and word recognition skills, that is,

the testing of single words and single sounds outside of a larger context. Of the remaining 38 items which comprise the reading comprehension subtest, 28 ask the student to select single words or single sentences based on the interpretation of a picture, or to select a picture based on the reading of short sentences. It is not until the last 10 items of the 89-item test that the student is given a passage to read. Two passages of 44 words each are presented and the student selects answers to five questions about each passage.

If the fundamental task of reading is deriving meaning from elaborated text, only 9% of this Metropolitan reading survey test assesses this capacity. Some school districts may choose to use only the reading comprehension portion of the test to evaluate their program. In this case, 10 of the 38 items, or 26% of the subtest, require reading and understanding elaborated passages in order to select the correct response. Thus the question of what "counts" as reading is important to the deliberation of what evidence to use when evaluating the effectiveness of a program. Selecting the correct responses on a test which provides little opportunity to read elaborated text may not be an appropriate effectiveness measure for the Reading Recovery program.

A related issue is that of the single measure nature of a pre-post test. As discussed earlier with regard to the selection process, a single test score is only one snapshot of a child's reading performance. How the child responds to the format of the test and to the testing situation may or may not reflect her reading performance with other materials or in other settings. Gauging her improvement in reading brought about by her participation in a special program on the basis of one isolated, and

perhaps unrepresentative, measure can be unfair to both the child and the program. A more comprehensive measure could be whether or not the child is able to function as a reader in the classroom setting without special assistance. Such a measure would require that the child demonstrate reading ability with a variety of materials and in a variety of situations at a level comparable to the average student in the classroom. In effect, it requires that the child become more self-sufficient as a reader.

Possibilities

Pre/post gain scores on standardized tests are one way of providing aggregate information about reading programs. Such scores do not necessarily indicate whether a student is becoming a reader independent of special services, however. Since the intent of the Chapter 1 law is to provide programs "of sufficient size, scope, and quality to give reasonable promise of substantial progress toward meeting the special educational needs of the children being served" (Augustus F. Hawkins-Robert T. Stafford Elementary and Secondary School Improvement Amendments of 1988, p. 23), another measure of effectiveness may be a useful addition.

One possibility would be to adjust the Chapter 1 evaluation guidelines to ask for a long term documentation of the percentage of Chapter 1 students who return for additional services in subsequent or later years. (Although implied in the sustained effects portion of the current Chapter 1 evaluation procedures, the actual percentage of students who no longer need services after their first year of Chapter 1 participation historically has not been systematically addressed nor reported in typical

Chapter 1 program evaluations). The task would be to keep track over several years of the number of Chapter 1 participants (both those receiving Reading Recovery and those receiving other forms of Chapter 1 assistance) who do and do not return for subsequent services.

Including this "discontinuation" measure as one aspect of the Chapter 1 evaluation allows an indicator of success available from Reading Recovery to be considered a legitimate measure of Chapter 1 program effectiveness as well. As deemed necessary for national and state reporting purposes, the pre/post NCE gain scores could continue to be collected and used as another indicator of success. These scores would not have to substitute, however, for an additional measure of effectiveness which may be more appropriate to the Reading Recovery portion of Chapter 1 funded programs.

Issue 3: Number of Students Served

Reading Recovery instruction takes place with one child at a time. Chapter 1 services usually are provided in groups ranging from four to eight children, with the typical group including five to six children. Using the group approach, a full-time Chapter 1 teacher might serve anywhere from 28 to 56 children depending on the needs of the students and the implementation decisions of the local district. On the other hand, the equivalent of a full-time Reading Recovery teacher would start the year serving eight children for 30 minutes each per day, with the intention of providing each 60 or more lessons until they are discontinued. Over the course of the year, the first eight children might be discontinued and another eight to ten would be picked up, depending on

the number of lessons needed by the children before they are discontinued. That is, some of the original eight may be discontinued from Reading Recovery by December; others may finish in January or February, thereby affecting the number who can be discontinued before the year is out. A realistic estimate would be that 20 first graders could receive 60 or more lessons from an experienced Reading Recovery teacher working the equivalent of full-time, with approximately 16 of these being discontinued. That is, a teacher providing Reading Recovery services half-time would typically provide 60 lessons for 10 children per year, discontinuing eight of them before the school year ended (Lyons, Pinnell, McCarrier, Young, DeFord, 1988).[1]

The differences in the number of children served between the two programs present difficulties for teachers and administrators who are trying to accommodate all the children needing services in first and later grades. If a school system has many second and third graders needing assistance, for example, it may be hard pressed to devote the services of the full-time equivalent of one teacher to 16 to 20 first graders in order to implement Reading Recovery.

The analysis of this issue yields a variety of solutions over the long term but very few for the short term. Over time, one could argue, there will be less second grade and older students who need services if all first graders at risk of reading failure can be recovered during their first grade year. If resources are devoted to first graders, there will be less need for such resources in the future. Thus local administrators

---

[1] This estimate is based on 1987-88 figures of 265 Reading Recovery teachers instructing 2,648 program children. "Program children" refers to those students who have been discontinued or who have received a minimum of 60 lessons. See pages 16 and 34 of Lyons, et al. (1988).

and teachers of reading are faced with the perennial social policy dilemma of whether to devote scarce resources toward the prevention of future problems or toward serving those who need assistance right now. Federal guidelines allow school districts to make these choices while encouraging districts to concentrate resources on the neediest students.

Possibilities

In Ohio, many school districts have addressed this dilemma by having a Chapter 1 teacher serve four Reading Recovery students during half the day and teach four groups of five to six non-Reading Recovery students during the remaining half of the day. In this way the reading teacher is serving 20 to 24 Chapter 1 students in groups and up to 8 to 10 Reading Recovery students over the course of the year, for a combined total of 28 to 34 students per year.

The following suggestions offer some additional organizational strategies for solving the short-term dilemma of how to serve all students currently in need as well as preventing failure for the youngest students. How these possibilities might play out depends largely on the circumstances of each district; for example, on the number of Reading Recovery teachers available and on how the students who need services are distributed across the grade levels and schools. These suggestions also assume that Reading Recovery continues as a voluntary program and that no teacher is required to participate. In addition, the suggestions take into account the requirement that Chapter 1 funds supplement, and not supplant, regular (non-Federal) funds. The law requires that children participating in Chapter 1 must receive the same services, from non-Federal sources, as they would have received in the absence of

Chapter 1. This means that Chapter 1 may not pay for the regular reading program customarily provided by the local school. If Reading Recovery becomes the regular reading program for those children, local funds must be continued to be provided to those children to the same extent as they would have without Chapter 1 assistance (Augustus F. Hawkins-Robert T. Stafford Elementary and Secondary School Improvement Amendments of 1988, p. 34; M. J. LeTendre, personal communication, June 8, 1989).

Suggestion 1: Assuming that local funds would support one first-grade teacher, combine these local funds with additional Chapter 1 funds to support a team of two first grade teachers serving one classroom. The two teachers alternate the teaching of Reading Recovery, one teaching four individual students in the morning and the other teaching a different four in the afternoon. Half of each teacher's salary is paid by Chapter 1 funds for the portion of the day when he or she is providing Reading Recovery services. (See Example 1 below.)

Example 1:

Two classroom teachers and two Chapter 1 reading specialists

First grade		Second grade	Third grade
am	pm		
RR	classroom	Chapter 1 teacher serving seven groups of 4-8 students each	Chapter 1 teacher serving seven groups of 4-8 students each
classroom	RR		
1 FTE teacher (2 half time)		1 FTE	1 FTE
16-20 RR students (8-10 served by each halftime RR teacher)		28-56 Chapter 1 students	28-56 Chapter 1 students

Grand total: 3 FTE supported by Chapter 1 funds
16-20 first graders served with Reading Recovery
28-56 second graders served in Chapter 1 groups
28-56 third graders served in Chapter 1 groups

If enough classroom teachers are willing to try this approach, it has several advantages. The coordination between Reading Recovery instruction

and that offered during the rest of the student's day is maximized by having the Reading Recovery teacher also responsible for other instruction (see Issue 4 below). With classroom teachers handling the Reading Recovery instruction of first graders, other non-Reading Recovery, Chapter 1-supported teachers can focus their attention on students in second grade and beyond. Chapter 1 funds are still supporting both intervention programs, however, one offered by classroom teachers and the other offered by special support staff. The number of first graders served is limited to 16 to 20 per full-time equivalent over the course of the year. The number of second and third graders served would vary from 28-56, depending upon the size of the Chapter 1 groups.

Suggestion 2: One or more Chapter 1 reading specialists serve individual Reading Recovery students in the morning and Chapter 1 groups in the afternoon. Some of the afternoon Chapter 1 groups are made up of first graders, others are made up of second graders. Additional Chapter 1 reading specialists focus on serving larger groups of second and/or third graders. The burden of serving larger numbers falls on the teachers of the older students, while the Reading Recovery teachers focus on preventing first graders from needing these services in the future. (See Example 2 below).

Example 2:

Three Chapter 1 reading specialists

Teacher 1		Teacher 2		Teacher 3
am	pm	am	pm	
4 RR students per day; 8-10 students served per year	Three Chap.1 groups of 4-8 first grade students each;	4 RR students per day; 8-10 students per year	Three Chap. 1 groups of 4-8 second graders	Seven Chapter 1 groups of 4-8 second and/or third graders
1 FTE 8-10 RR students 12-24 Chapter 1 first graders		1 FTE 8-10 RR students 12-24 Chapter 1 second graders		1 FTE 28-56 Chapter 1 second and/or third graders
Total: 20-34 first graders served		Total: 8-10 RR first graders and 12-24 second graders served		Total: 28-56 second and/or third graders served

Grand total: 3 FTE teachers supported by Chapter 1 funds
28-44 first graders served (16-20 of which are Reading Recovery)
40-80 additional students in second and third grade served in Chapter 1 groups.

With this approach, first graders are served either as individuals with Reading Recovery or as part of small groups with non-Reading Recovery instruction. The decision of which first-grade students should receive which form of services raises additional selection questions. This approach has the advantage of serving more first graders, but the same number (16-20) receive Reading Recovery instruction as in Suggestion 1 above.

Suggestion 3: Another approach to increasing the number of students served would be to explore how some Reading Recovery strategies might be taught in a group setting. If some of the strategies can be introduced to more than one child at a time, perhaps as preliminary to or follow-up from individual sessions, this approach could increase the number of first graders being served at one time by each Reading Recovery teacher. This approach could also increase the number served over the course of the year if it results in students needing fewer individual lessons and discontinuing sooner, thereby making the teacher available for other students.

Issue 4: Coordination of Reading Instruction

The concerns regarding coordination of reading instruction are focused in two directions: between Reading Recovery and first grade classroom instruction; and between first and second grade instruction for non-discontinued Reading Recovery students. The basic issue is how the reading strategies taught and reinforced in the classroom blend with those taught during the Reading Recovery lesson. For example, the first grade Reading Recovery student who comes across an unknown word may be encouraged to approach the word with a variety of strategies, all of which focus her attention on the meaning: she might return to the beginning of the sentence and reread, or check for cues found in the picture accompanying the story; she might use a sense of sentence structure to

help her predict what the word might be; or she might consider known words which look similar to the unknown word (Clay, 1979).

On the same day, in a different classroom lesson, the child may be told only to "sound out" an unfamiliar word, thereby focusing the child's attention away from the overall message of the text and onto the individual letters in a given word. Such conflicting advice may undo a fledgling reader (Allington & Broikou, 1988).

How closely classroom and Reading Recovery instruction need to complement each other in order to foster the development of young readers is a question beyond the scope of this document. The issue raised for discussion here is what happens to young children already at risk of reading failure who come up against contradictory practices and beliefs about the reading process from their different teachers. This possibility also occurs for those children who have not had time to complete the needed number of Reading Recovery lessons when the school year ends. The nature of both their second grade classroom reading instruction and that offered by specialized reading teachers may support or contradict the reading strategies that were introduced during their Reading Recovery lessons as first graders.

Possibilities

Among the possibilities for fostering coordination of reading instruction across different teachers is the encouraging of classroom teachers to become Reading Recovery teachers. This approach has several advantages. It ensures that the strategies introduced in Reading Recovery lessons are reinforced throughout the school day. It allows classroom teachers to apply insights about the reading process gained from the

Reading Recovery training to all their students and to the reading tasks embedded in the instruction of other subject areas. Finally, it increases the likelihood that the Reading Recovery innovation will be sustained in schools over time, especially after special funding is no longer available. To have long-term effects, innovations must become incorporated into and adapted to the ongoing practices and policies of the school (McLaughlin, 1987).

Such an approach requires the rearrangement of some Chapter 1 resources, however. As noted above with regard to the issue of the number of students served, Chapter 1 funds might support the time a team of two classroom teachers spend teaching Reading Recovery. The remainder of their day would be supported by regular district funds. Or another teacher may take over a classroom while the regular classroom teacher is teaching Reading Recovery to one or more students. Chapter 1 funds could again support the time the regular classroom teacher spends teaching Reading Recovery. In this way the Reading Recovery innovation is supplied by the classroom teacher but with the financial support of the Chapter 1 program. (The fiscal accountability concerns raised by this possibility are addressed below in connection with Issue 5.)

A possible way to overcome the difficulties of coordinating reading instruction for second graders is to assign non-discontinued Reading Recovery students to Chapter 1 staff who have volunteered for Reading Recovery training. The instruction students receive as a part of the support services in second grade will reinforce the strategies introduced to them as Reading Recovery students in the first grade. Another possibility is to arrange for non-discontinued first graders to complete the unfinished Reading Recovery lessons as second graders. Given that the

distinction between first and second graders is based on a school calendar organized around agrarian times, it may not be instructionally important for the young reader if his/her Reading Recovery lessons finish before or after the summer break.

Issue 5: Accounting for Chapter 1 Funds

A critical concern of Chapter 1 administrators at both the local and state level is accountability for federal dollars. Since its inception as ESEA Title I in 1965, the regulations accompanying the compensatory education law have become increasingly specific (Odden, 1987). Most of the specifications focused on monitoring the use of federal funds. The focus on "following the federal dollars" gave rise to the development of the separate Chapter 1 administrative hierarchies currently present at the school, district and state levels. Chapter 1 teachers report to Chapter 1 administrators at the district office; these in turn report local compliance with the regulations to state Chapter 1 administrators, who assure local and state compliance with federal law and regulations to the U. S. Department of Education (Ginsburg & Turnbull, 1981; Kirst, 1983).

The administrative and instructional outcome of this separation is evident in the common practice of hiring separate Chapter 1 teachers to take identified children from the regular classroom and teach them with specialized materials in separate rooms of the school. In Ohio, for example, the Chapter 1 coordinator's handbook states: "Usual procedure is to schedule small groups of children into a separate room for short periods of time" (Ohio Department of Education, 1987, p. 14). This practice has enabled Chapter 1 administrators to clearly document that the federal funds are going to the targeted students (that is, low-achieving

students within schools whose attendance areas include high concentrations of low-income families). The fact that the federal dollars are not being used as a part of the general school funds was made obvious by the separation of both personnel and instruction from the regular classroom.

Possibilities

Implementing Reading Recovery as a part of Chapter 1 services has implications for this strict separation of Chapter 1 personnel and instruction, however. In order to provide coordinated reading instruction and to maintain the Reading Recovery innovation over the long term, it may be best to teach Reading Recovery in combination with the classroom teachers, rather than only through a Chapter 1 teacher separated administratively and instructionally from the regular program. Two ways of making this logistically possible have been suggested earlier. They include teaming a Chapter 1 teacher with one or more classroom teachers to free up the classroom teachers to provide the Reading Recovery instruction. In effect, the teacher providing the Reading Recovery services is paid for by Chapter 1. The other approach provides Chapter 1 funds to support the additional time needed by a team of two classroom teachers to teach Reading Recovery to students in their shared classroom. Once again, Chapter 1 funds are paying for the time spent teaching Reading Recovery no matter who provides the instruction.

Both of these possibilities call for changes in the traditional organization of Chapter 1 resources. Rather than keep the traditional isolated organization, as a part of what has been characterized as a "second system of education" (Wang, Reynolds, & Walberg, 1988), the Chapter 1 services could be provided within the mainstream of the regular

program. The Chapter 1 law allows this variation of typical practice as a local district option and it can be done while still being accountable for Chapter 1 funds. The need to "follow the federal dollars" could be accomplished by developing procedures for documenting the provision of Chapter 1 assistance in the regular classroom. Documentation is needed to demonstrate when Chapter 1 funds are used to:

a. Provide the services of an additional teacher to regular classrooms to allow classroom teachers to provide the one-to-one teaching of Reading Recovery students; and/or

b. Pay for that portion of time that a team of classroom teachers spends teaching Reading Recovery to the students in their shared classroom.

In other words, by developing ways to document services provided for in the regular classroom, Chapter 1 funding can be used to provide Reading Recovery instruction by classroom teachers. Although it requires a restructuring of the way Chapter 1 programs traditionally have been organized in the past, this approach offers a way of institutionalizing the Reading Recovery service within the regular school program.

Conclusion

The implication of the suggestions raised in this document is that both the Chapter 1 and Reading Recovery policies and practices may need to be adjusted in order to accommodate the instructional and accountability needs of the other. Given the similarity of the overall purpose of the two programs, however, these accommodations may be in the best interest of all the students and educators involved. To accommodate both approaches, educators need to address the dilemmas surrounding the issues of selection procedures, evaluation of program effectiveness, number of students served, coordination of instruction, and accounting for federal dollars.

References

Allington, R. L., & Broikou, K. A. (1988). Development of shared knowledge: A new role for classroom and specialist teachers. The Reading Teacher, 41(8), 806-811.

Augustus F. Hawkins-Robert T. Stafford. (1988). Elementary and Secondary School Improvement Amendments of 1988, Public Law, 100-297. Washington, DC:

Birman, B. F. et al. (1987). Current operations of Chapter 1 programs: National assessment of Chapter 1. U.S. Department of Education. Washington, DC: Government Printing Office.

Boehnlien, M. (1987). Reading intervention for high-risk first graders. Educational Leadership, 44,(6), 32-37.

Chapter One in Ohio. (1987) Educational Consolidation and Improvement Act, 21st Annual Evaluation Report. Columbus, OH: Ohio Department of Education.

Clay, M. M. (1985). The early detection of reading difficulties (3rd ed.) Auckland, New Zealand: Heinemann Educational Books.

Code of Federal Regulations. (1986, July, 1). Education, 34, Parts 200, 203, 204 Revised. Washington, DC: Author.

Ginsburg, A. L., & Turnbull, B. J. (1981). Local program coordination: An alternative structure for federal aid to schools. Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis, 3, 33-42.

Guttmann, B., & Henderson, A. (1988). A summary of state Chapter 1 participation and achievement information for 1985-86. Washington, DC: Decisions Resources Corporation.

Henrysson, S. (1971). Gathering, analyzing and using data on test items. In R. L. Thorndike (Ed.), Educational measurement (2nd ed.) (pp. 130-159). Washington, DC: American Council on Education.

Kennedy, M. (1987). Effectiveness of Chapter 1 services. U. S. Department of Education. Washington, DC: Government Printing Office.

Kenoyer, C., Cooper, D., Saxton, D. E., Hoepfner, R. (1981). The effects of discontinuing compensatory education support services. Report 11 of the sustaining effects study. Santa Monica, CA: Systems Development Corporation.

Kirst, M. (1983). Teaching policy and federal categorical programs. In L. S. Shulman & G. Sykes (Eds.), Handbook of Teaching and Policy (pp. 426-448). New York: Longman.

Lyons, C., Pinnell, G. S., McCarrier, A., Young, P., DeFord, D. (1988). The Ohio reading recovery project. Vol. X State of Ohio, Year 2 -- 1987-1988. Columbus, OH: The Ohio State University.

McLaughlin, M. W. (1987). Learning from experience: Lessons from policy implementation. Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis, 9, 171-178.

National Institute of Education. (1978). Compensatory Education Study: A Final Report. Washington, DC: Author.

Odden, A. (1987). Education reform and services to poor children: Can the two policies be compatible? Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis, 9, 231-243.

Ohio Department of Education, (1987). Handbook for Chapter 1 coordinators in Ohio. Columbus, OH: Author.

Pinnell, G. S., DeFord, D. E., Lyons, C. A. (1988). Early intervention in literacy education: A report of the Ohio reading recovery project. New York: Educational Research Service.

Pinnell, G. S. (1987a). Helping teachers see how readers read: Staff Development through observation. Theory into Practice, 26, 51-58.

Pinnell, G. S. (1987b, April). Reading recovery: A pilot study and follow-up of the effects of an early intervention program in reading. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Washington, DC.

Pinnell, G. S. (1985). Helping teachers help children at risk: Insights from the Reading Recovery program. Peobody Journal of Education, 62, (3), 70-85.

Prescott, G. A., Balow, I. H. Hogan, T. P. Farr, R. C. (1985). MAT 6 Reading survey tests. San Antonio, TX: The Psychological Corporation, Harcourt Brace Jovanovich

Roberts, A. O. H. (1976). Out-of-level testing. ESEA Title I Evaluation and Reporting System, Technical Report No. 6. Mountain View, CA: RMC Research Corporation.

Roberts, S. J. (1978). Test floor and ceiling effects. ESEA Title I Evaluation and Reporting System. Mountain View, CA: RMC Corporation.

Wang, M. C., Reynolds, M. C., & Walberg, H. J. (1988) Integrating the children of the second system. Phi Delta Kappan, 70(3), 248-252.

Young, I. P. & Pinnell, G. S. (1987, April). Children at-risk: Reading Recovery. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Washington, DC.